

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-30 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 15, 27, and 30 have been amended. Claims 3 and 17 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the September 8, 2004 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda, U.S. Patent No. 5,867,730 ("Leyda"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,387 to Chrabaszcz ("Chrabaszcz") further in view of Thambidurai (Internet Printing). Claims 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Chrabaszcz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,012 to White ("White") further in view of Thambidurai. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Chrabaszcz in view of a combination of White and Thambidurai, further in view of applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("APA"). Claims 2, 3, 11, 16, 17, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda in view of Chrabaszcz and Thambidurai further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,565 to DeRosa Jr. et al. ("DeRosa"). Claims 4 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda, in view of Chrabaszcz, Thambidurai, and DeRosa, further in view of White. Claims 7-9, 12-14, 20, 21, and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda in view of Chrabaszcz, Thambidurai, and DeRosa, further in view of APA. These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to a method of configuring a computer for installation of a peripheral device. A print server is prepared to retrieve a

first device identification from a memory of the peripheral device. The print server, the peripheral device, and the computer are connected via a computer network. The print server is directly connected to the computer, and the peripheral device is indirectly connected to the computer. The first device identification is compared to device names on a list of names associated with device drivers, and the list and the drivers are stored in a memory of the computer. An associated driver is selected for use if the first device identification matches one of the names. At least a portion of a routine for the preparing, comparing, and selecting operations is stored in a memory of the computer.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites (with emphasis added):

A method of configuring a computer for installation of a peripheral device, the method comprising:

preparing a print server to retrieve a first device identification from a memory of the peripheral device, the print server, the peripheral device, and the computer being connected via a computer network, wherein the print server is directly connected to the computer, and the peripheral device is indirectly connected to the computer;

comparing the first device identification to device names on a list of names associated with device drivers, the list and the drivers being stored in a memory of the computer;

selecting for use an associated device driver if the first device identification matches one of the names, wherein at least a portion of a routine for the preparing, comparing, and selecting operations is stored in a memory of the computer, and at least a portion of the routine for the preparing, comparing, and selecting operations is stored in a memory of the print server;

determining whether the peripheral device and the corresponding selected device driver have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database of the print server;

retrieving countermeasure information required to resolve the identified installation problem from the database; and

providing the countermeasure information to a user to enable installation of the selected device driver.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda, in view of Chrabaszczyk, further in view of Thambidurai (Internet Printing). Claims 2, 3, 11, 16, 17, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leyda in view of Chrabaszczyk and Thambidurai further in view of DeRosa.

None of the cited references, i.e., the Lyda reference, the Charabaszczyk reference, Thambidurai reference, or the DeRosa reference discloses, teaches, or suggests the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended. Unlike the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended, the Lyda reference, the Charabaszczyk reference, Thambidurai reference, and the DeRosa reference do not show “determining whether the peripheral device and the corresponding selected device driver have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database of the print server; retrieving countermeasure information required to resolve the identified installation problem from the database; and providing the countermeasure information to a user to enable installation of the selected device driver.”

In rejecting claim 3 as being obvious over Leyda in view of Chrabaszcz and Thambidurai further in view of DeRosa, the Examiner stated "Leyda does not teach determining whether the peripheral device requires a special measure in order to install the selected device driver, identifying an appropriate special measure from a database of potential special measures stored in a memory of the print server, and informing a user of the appropriate special measure. Chrabaszcz teaches (col. 11, lines 42-54) determining whether the peripheral device requires a special measure in order to install the selected device driver (the program determines ... are required), identifying an appropriate special measure from a database of potential special measures stored in a memory of the print server (By looking up a table ... that device), and informing a user of the appropriate special measure (the program announces ... required values)."

The Chrabaszcz reference states that "in state 812, the program determines whether additional data is required to configure the system. Because the Device ID and Vendor ID of the device is known, the program can determine what additional parameters are required. By looking up a table of configuration requirements for that device, the program generates a finite list of parameters that are required to load an appropriate driver for that device. If it is determined that additional data is required, in state 814, the program announces the detection of the new device and prompts a user to enter the additionally required values. If it is determined that additional data is not required, the program proceeds directly from state 812 to state 816. In state 816, the program automatically loads the appropriate driver with the additional data collected by the user, if any." (Column 11, lines 42-57.)

The Chrabaszcz reference, the Lyda reference, Thambidurai reference, or the DeRosa reference makes no mention whatsoever of “determining whether the peripheral device and the corresponding selected device driver have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database of the print server; retrieving countermeasure information required to resolve the identified installation problem from the database; and providing the countermeasure information to a user to enable installation of the selected device driver.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the above-cited references. Claims 2, and 4-14 all depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, and 4-14 distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Independent claims 15, 27, and 30 recite limitations similar to amended independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 15 recites “the processor determines whether the at least one printer and the corresponding selected device driver have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database of the print server, and retrieves countermeasure information required to resolve the identified installation problem from the database, and provides the countermeasure information to a user to enable installation of the selected device driver”. Claim 27 recites “determining whether the printer and at least one of the printer drivers have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database in the print server; retrieving countermeasure information required to resolve the identified

installation problem from the database; and installing at least one of the printer drivers in a second computer based upon the information associated with the first installation and the countermeasure information". Claim 30 recites "determine whether the peripheral device and the corresponding selected device driver have a previously identified installation problem using historical information stored in a database; retrieve countermeasure information required to resolve the identified installation problem from the database; and provide the countermeasure information to a user to enable installation of the selected device driver." Therefore, independent claims 15, 27, and 30 also distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Claims 16, and 18-26 all depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, and 18-26 distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Claims 28 and 29 depend directly from independent claim 27, as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28 and 29 distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call either of the undersigned attorneys at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the

application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: December 8, 2004

By:



Roger R. Wise

Registration No. 31,204

Attorney for Applicants

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033